



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/056,596

01/24/2002

David Collier

GE - 120432

4700

7590

12/23/2008

John S. Beulick  
Armstrong Teasdale LLP  
One Metropolitan Sq., Suite 2600  
St. Louis, MO 63102

EXAMINER

GOLD, AVI M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2457

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/23/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/056,596	<b>Applicant(s)</b> COLLIER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> AVI GOLD	<b>Art Unit</b> 2457	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 and 38-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 and 38-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is responsive to the amendment filed on November 14, 2008. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 13, 28, and 36 were amended. Claim 45 was added. Claims 1-36 and 38-45 are pending.

### ***Response to Amendment***

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-12, 28-32, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curtis, U.S. Patent No. 6,668,279, further in view of Papadopoulos et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,061,603.

Curtis teaches the invention substantially as claimed including methods and apparatus for enabling a web server to transport data to an in-kernel HTTP cache (see abstract).

As to claim 1, Curtis teaches a web-enabled automation control module (ACM) comprising:

an ACM central processing unit (CPU) (col. 6, lines 1-10, Curtis discloses a CPU used in HTTP transport acceleration); and

a web and file transfer system electrically connected to said ACM CPU, said web and file transfer system embedded within said ACM, said web and file transfer system comprising a web server, a file transfer server, and a database comprising at least one web page file, said web and file transfer system configured to: process hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) requests from a network (col. 2, lines 54-65, Curtis discloses a request and response HTTP data transport; col. 4, lines 39-48, Curtis discloses a web server receiving and processing HTTP requests; col. 10, lines 59-65, Curtis discloses the CPU being connected to input/output devices; col. 1, lines 21-36, Curtis discloses a web server used to access a web page).

Curtis fails to teach the limitation further including using form data from the HTTP requests to transfer ACM data to said ACM CPU to control operation of said ACM, wherein ACM is one of a programmable logic controller (PLC), a computer numeric control (CNC), and a motion control product.

However, Papadopoulos teaches a system for coupling a network of programmable controllers through an internetwork to a monitoring and control device (see abstract). Papadopoulos teaches the use of interacting with choices on a web page to control operation of an ACM (col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 39) and teaches the use of ACMs that are PLCs (col. 2, lines 30-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Curtis in view of Papadopoulos to use form data from the HTTP

requests to transfer ACM data to said ACM CPU to control operation of said ACM, wherein ACM is one of a programmable logic controller (PLC), a computer numeric control (CNC), and a motion control product. One would be motivated to do so because it allows an efficient way to control devices connected to the CPU and for the automation of a factory.

Regarding claim 2, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 1 wherein said web server is electrically connected to said ACM CPU and the network, said web server configured to process HTTP requests from the network (col. 4, lines 39-48, Curtis discloses a web server receiving and processing HTTP requests).

Regarding claim 3, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 2 wherein said web server configured to receive HTTP requests from the network (col. 4, lines 39-48).

Regarding claim 4, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 3 wherein said web server configured to respond to HTTP requests from the network (col. 1, lines 21-36, col. 4, lines 39-48, Curtis discloses a web server responding to HTTP requests).

Regarding claim 5, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 4 wherein said database electrically connected to said web server, said web server configured to read said at least one web page file from said database (col. 1, lines 21-36).

Regarding claim 6, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 2 wherein said web server configured to transfer ACM data from said ACM CPU (col. 1, lines 21-36, col. 4, lines 39-48).

Regarding claim 7, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 2 wherein said web server configured to transfer ACM data to said ACM CPU (col. 1, lines 21-36, col. 4, lines 39-48).

Regarding claim 8, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 5 wherein said web server configured to transfer ACM data from said ACM CPU and embed said ACM data within said at least one web page file based on function tags embedded within said at least one web page file (col. 1, lines 21-36).

Regarding claim 9, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 8 wherein said web server configured to send said at least one web page file through said network using HTTP (col. 1, lines 21-36, col. 4, lines 39-48).

Regarding claim 10, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 1 wherein said web and file transfer system further comprises a network interface configured for connection to the network (col. 1, lines 21-36, col. 4, lines 39-48).

Regarding claim 11, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 1 wherein said web and file transfer system further configured to store user defined web pages (col. 1, lines 21-36).

Regarding claim 12, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 1 wherein said ACM comprises a backplane interface electrically connected to said ACM and a ACM backplane electrically connected to said backplane interface, said ACM backplane configured for connection with at least one of an input/output (I/O) module and an input module (col. 10, lines 59-65, Curtis discloses the CPU being connected to input/output devices).

Regarding claim 28, Curtis teaches a method for management and control of an automation control module (ACM) including an ACM central processing unit (CPU):

embedding a web and file transfer system within the ACM including electrically connecting the web and file transfer system to the ACM CPU, the web and file transfer system includes a web server, a file transfer server, and a database configured to store at least one web page file (col. 1, lines 21-36, col. 2, lines 54-65, col. 4, lines 39-48, col. 6, lines 1-10, col. 10, lines 59-65);

electrically connecting the web and file transfer system to a network (col. 4, lines 39-48); and

processing hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) requests from the network using the web and file transfer system (col. 4, lines 39-48).

Curtis fails to teach the limitation further including using form data from the HTTP requests to transfer ACM data to said ACM CPU to control operation of said ACM, wherein ACM is one of a programmable logic controller (PLC), a computer numeric control (CNC), and a motion control product.

However, Papadopoulos teaches the use of interacting with choices on a web page to control operation of an ACM (col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 39) and teaches the use of ACMs that are PLCs (col. 2, lines 30-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Curtis in view of Papadopoulos to use form data from the HTTP requests to transfer ACM data to said ACM CPU to control operation of said ACM, wherein ACM is one of a programmable logic controller (PLC), a computer numeric control (CNC), and a motion control product. One would be motivated to do so because it allows an efficient way to control devices connected to the CPU and for the automation of a factory.

Regarding claim 29, Curtis teaches a method in accordance with claim 28 wherein the web server is electronically connected to the ACM CPU and the network, processing HTTP requests from the network using the web and file transfer system comprises processing HTTP requests from the network using the web server (col. 2, lines 54-65, col. 4, lines 39-48, col. 6, lines 1-10).



Regarding claim 30, Curtis teaches a method in accordance with claim 29 wherein processing HTTP requests from the network using the web server comprises: receiving HTTP requests from the network using the web server; and responding to the HTTP requests using the web server (col. 4, lines 39-48).

Regarding claim 31, Curtis teaches a method in accordance with claim 29 wherein the database is electrically connected to the web server processing HTTP requests from the network using the web server comprises: receiving HTTP requests from the network; reading the at least one web page file from the database; requesting ACM data from the ACM CPU via function tags embedded within the at least one web page file; receiving the ACM data from the ACM CPU; embedding the ACM data within the at least one web page file; and sending the at least one web page file through the network (col. 1, lines 21-36, col. 2, lines 54-65, col. 4, lines 39-48, col. 6, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 32, Curtis teaches a method in accordance with claim 29 wherein processing HTTP requests from the network using the web server comprises transferring ACM data to the ACM CPU using the web server as directed by function tags embedded within at least one web page file and by form data contained in the HTTP request (col. 1, lines 21-36).

Regarding claim 45, Curtis teaches an ACM in accordance with claim 1 wherein said ACM is in operational control communication with a device (col. 10, lines 59-65).

3. Claims 13-27 and 33-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curtis in view of Pettersen, U.S. Patent No. 6,826,594, further in view of Papadopoulos et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,061,603.

Curtis teaches the invention substantially as claimed including methods and apparatus for enabling a web server to transport data to an in-kernel HTTP cache (see abstract).

Regarding claim 13, Curtis teaches an automation control module (ACM) system comprising: an ACM; a network; a web-enabled computer electrically connected to said network; and a web and file transfer subsystem electrically connected to said ACM and said network, said web and file transfer subsystem comprising a web server, a file transfer server, and a database, said subsystem configured to store at least one user-defined web page file in said database (col. 1, lines 21-36, col. 2, lines 54-65, col. 4, lines 39-48, col. 6, lines 1-10, col. 10, lines 59-65).

Curtis fails to teach the limitation further including the use of a user-defined web file.

However, Pettersen teaches systems and methods for dynamic construction of a web page via electronic links over a global electronic network, such as the Internet (see abstract). Pettersen teaches the use of a user creating their own web page and

Art Unit: 2457

embedding their generated dynamic code in additional, but different, web pages (col. 10, lines 6-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Curtis in view of Pettersen to use user-defined web pages. One would be motivated to do so because it allows for dynamic customized web sites.

Curtis also fails to teach the limitation further including using form data from the HTTP requests to transfer ACM data to said ACM to control operation of said ACM, wherein ACM is one of a programmable logic controller (PLC), a computer numeric control (CNC), and a motion control product.

However, Papadopoulos teaches the use of interacting with choices on a web page to control operation of an ACM (col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 39) and teaches the use of ACMs that are PLCs (col. 2, lines 30-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Curtis in view of Papadopoulos to use form data from the HTTP requests to transfer ACM data to said ACM to control operation of said ACM, wherein ACM is one of a programmable logic controller (PLC), a computer numeric control (CNC), and a motion control product. One would be motivated to do so because it allows an efficient way to control devices connected to the CPU and for the automation of a factory.

Regarding claim 14, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 13 wherein a database is electrically connected to said network and said file transfer server (col. 2, lines 54-65).

Regarding claim 15, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 14 wherein said file transfer server is configured to read and write to said at least one user-defined web page file stored in said database (col. 1, lines 21-36).

Regarding claim 16, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 13 wherein said file transfer server configured to transfer said at least one user-defined web-page file through said network to said computer (col. 1, lines 21-36).

As to claim 17, Pettersen teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 16 wherein said file transfer server configured to allow a user to perform at least one of create said at least one user-defined web page file and modify at least one user-defined web page file (col. 10, lines 6-50).

Regarding claim 18, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 13 wherein said at least one user-defined web page file comprises at least one of hypertext markup language (HTML), Javascript, and references to other files (col. 1, lines 21-36).

Regarding claim 19, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 18 wherein said references to other files comprise at least one of at least one image file and at least one Applet (col. 1, lines 21-36).

Regarding claim 20, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 13 wherein said at least one user-defined web page file comprises at least one ACM tag function (col. 1, lines 21-36).

Regarding claim 21, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 13 wherein said file transfer server is a file transfer protocol server (col. 2, lines 54-65).

Regarding claim 22, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 14 wherein said web and file transfer subsystem further comprises a network interface electrically connected to said file transfer server and said network (col. 4, lines 39-48).

Regarding claim 23, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 22 wherein said ACM comprises an ACM central processing unit (CPU), said web and file transfer subsystem further comprises a web server electrically connected to said network and said ACM CPU, said ACM, and said database, said web-server configured to process hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) requests from a network (col. 2, lines 54-65, col. 4, lines 39-48, col. 6, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 24, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 13 configured to display at least one user-defined web page file on said computer (col. 1, lines 21-36).

Regarding claim 25, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 13 wherein a user is required to enter a valid user name and user password to access said ACM system (col. 2, lines 54-65).

Regarding claim 26, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 25 wherein said user configures the number of web and file transfer TCP connections using said computer (col. 2, lines 54-65).

Regarding claim 27, Curtis teaches an ACM system in accordance with claim 26 further configured to disable said web and file transfer TCP connections when said user configures zero of said web and file transfer TCP connections (col. 2, lines 54-65).

Regarding claim 33, Pettersen teaches a method in accordance with claim 28 wherein the file transfer server electrically connected to the database and the network, said method further comprising: storing at least one user-defined web page in the database; reading the at least one user-defined web page using the file transfer server and the network; and writing to the at least one user-defined web page using the file transfer server and the network (col. 10, lines 6-50).

Regarding claim 34, Curtis teaches a method in accordance with claim 31 wherein the database includes at least one user name and at least one user password, the network includes at least one computer electrically connected to the network, said method further comprising requiring a user input a valid user name and valid user password into the computer to access the web and file transfer system (col. 2, lines 54-65).

Regarding claim 35, Curtis teaches a method in accordance with claim 34 further comprising;

allowing a user to configure the number of web and file transfer TCP connections using the computer; and

disabling the web and file transfer TCP connections when the user configures zero of the web and file transfer TCP connections (col. 2, lines 54-65).

Regarding claim 36, Curtis teaches a method for management and control of an automation control module (ACM) using an ACM system, the ACM system including an ACM, a network, and a web-enabled computer electrically connected to the ACM, said method comprising:

embedding a web and file transfer subsystem within the ACM including electrically connecting the web and file transfer subsystem to the ACM and the network, the web and file transfer subsystem includes a web server, a file transfer server, and a

Art Unit: 2457

database (col. 1, lines 21-36, col. 2, lines 54-65, col. 4, lines 39-48, col. 6, lines 1-10, col. 10, lines 59-65);

storing at least web page file in the database (col. 1, lines 21-36, col. 2, lines 54-65, col. 6, lines 1-10); and

Curtis fails to teach the limitation further including the use of a user-defined web page.

However, Pettersen teaches the use of a user creating their own web page and embedding their generated dynamic code in additional, but different, web pages (col. 10, lines 6-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Curtis in view of Pettersen to use user-defined web pages. One would be motivated to do so because it allows for dynamic customized web sites.

Curtis also fails to teach the limitation further including using form data from the HTTP requests to transfer ACM data to said ACM to control operation of said ACM, wherein ACM is one of a programmable logic controller (PLC), a computer numeric control (CNC), and a motion control product.

However, Papadopoulos teaches the use of interacting with choices on a web page to control operation of an ACM (col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 39) and teaches the use of ACMs that are PLCs (col. 2, lines 30-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Curtis in view of Papadopoulos to use form data from the HTTP requests to transfer ACM data to said ACM to control operation of said ACM, wherein



Art Unit: 2457

ACM is one of a programmable logic controller (PLC), a computer numeric control (CNC), and a motion control product. One would be motivated to do so because it allows an efficient way to control devices connected to the CPU and for the automation of a factory.

Regarding claim 38, Pettersen teaches a method in accordance with claim 36 further comprising: reading the at least one user-defined web page file stored in the database using the file transfer server; and writing to the at least one user-defined web page file stored in the database using the file transfer server (col. 10, lines 6-50).

Regarding claim 39, Pettersen teaches a method in accordance with claim 38 wherein reading the at least one user-defined web page file stored in the database using the file transfer server further comprising: transferring the at least one user-defined web page file to the computer; and displaying the at least one user-defined web page file on the computer using the file transfer server (col. 10, lines 6-50).

Regarding claim 40, Pettersen teaches a method in accordance with claim 38 wherein writing to the at least one user-defined web page file stored in the database using the file transfer server comprises allowing a user to modify the at least one user-defined web page file using the computer and the file transfer server (col. 10, lines 6-50).

Regarding claim 41, Pettersen teaches a method in accordance with claim 36 further comprising allowing a user to create a user-defined web page file using the computer and the file transfer server (col. 10, lines 6-50).

Regarding claim 42, Curtis teaches a method in accordance with claim 36 wherein the ACM includes an ACM central processing unit (CPU) and the web and file transfer subsystem further includes a web server electrically connected to the network and the ACM CPU, said method further comprising: processing hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) requests from the computer using the web server (col. 4, lines 39-48).

Regarding claim 43, Curtis teaches a method in accordance with claim 36 wherein the database includes at least one user name and at least one user password, said method further comprising requiring a user input a valid user name and valid user password into the computer to access the web and file transfer subsystem (col. 2, lines 54-65).

Regarding claim 44, Curtis teaches a method in accordance with claim 43 further comprising; allowing a user to configure the number of web and file transfer TCP connections using the computer; and disabling the web and file transfer TCP connections when the user configures zero of the web and file transfer TCP connections (col. 2, lines 54-65).

***Claim Objections***

4. Claim 28 is objected to because of the following informalities: The newly added limitation appears to be missing a portion when compared to the similar newly added limitation to the other independent claims. Appropriate correction is required.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-36 and 38-45 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

6. The Examiner recommends that Applicant thoroughly review the Papadopoulos et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,061,603), Williamson (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0083770), Nordquist et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0014160), and Borders et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,004,402) references, in comparison to the specification of the current application, prior to amending the claims.

***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,598,083 to Remer et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,629,127 to Deen et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,684,257 to Camut et al.

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0083770 to Williamson, because it discloses a web page used to control a device.

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0014160 to Nordquist et al., because it discloses a web page used for controlling a device.

U.S. Patent No. 7,004,402 to Borders et al., because it discloses using security measures to access a web site to then be able to control a device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AVI GOLD whose telephone number is (571)272-4002. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:30 (1st Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Avi Gold

Patent Examiner

Application/Control Number: 10/056,596  
Art Unit: 2457

Page 20

Art Unit 2157

AMG

/ARIO ETIENNE/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457